

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

STEPHANIE RODRIGUEZ; SAMUEL)	CIVIL NO. 08-00189 SOM/BMK
OYOLA-PEREZ; JULIUS RIGGINS;)	
and NILDA MEYER, Individually)	ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR
and as personal)	SUPPLEMENTAL JUROR
representative of the estate)	QUESTIONNAIRE (DOC. NO. 586);
of Wilfredo Dayandante)	ORDER REGARDING MOTIONS
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
GENERAL DYNAMICS ARMAMENT AND)	
TECHNICAL PRODUCTS, INC., et)	
al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL
JUROR QUESTIONNAIRE (DOC. NO. 586);
ORDER REGARDING MOTIONS

On August 30, 2010, Defendant General Dynamics Armament and Technical Products, Inc. ("GDATP") asked the court to supplement its proposed juror questionnaire. This court denied that request, stating:

At this late date, it is difficult to include substantive additions proposed by counsel. Such matters would require further discussion and might have been possible had counsel voiced their proposals earlier instead of waiting to react to the court-initiated questionnaire addressed to availability issues. The court here declines to add the additional questions proposed by Defendants.

See Minute Order (August 31, 2010) (Doc. No. 579).

On September 8, 2010, GDATP submitted a request for this court to require potential jurors to answer the identical questions on the morning they report for jury service. The court notes that many of GDATP's proposed questions will be asked by the court in the course of normal voir dire. Other questions proposed by GDATP would require much discussion and almost certain objections from other parties. For those reasons, the court declines to require potential jurors to answer the proposed supplemental juror questionnaire.

The court recognizes that it has experienced litigators representing the parties in this matter. For that reason, unless it is impracticable, the court requires the parties to meet and confer regarding any and all issues that may be raised to this court from this day forward. Only if the parties cannot agree on an issue may a party file a motion with this court seeking relief. All future motions must contain a representation as to the other side's position on an issue or an explanation as to why it was impracticable to obtain the other side's position as to the issue.

The parties are further ordered to meet and confer as to whether an agreement can be reached as to any pending motion, including motions in limine. No later than September 30, 2010, the parties shall submit to the court a report detailing their

discussions and explaining whether an agreement has been reached as to any motion pending before this court. If an agreement has been reached, the parties should immediately submit a proposed stipulation and the corresponding motion should be withdrawn.

As used in this order, "meet and confer" requires a live discussion. The parties may comply with the "meet and confer" requirements contained in this order by meeting in person or by having discussions via telephone, teleconference, or videoconference. Merely sending letters, facsimiles, or emails will not satisfy the "meet and confer" requirements of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, September 9, 2010.



/s/ Susan Oki Mollway
Susan Oki Mollway
United States District Judge

Rodriguez v. General Dynamics Armament and Technical Products, Inc., Civ. No. 08-00189 SOM/BMK; ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL JUROR QUESTIONNAIRE (DOC. NO. 586); ORDER REGARDING MOTIONS